



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/725,005	11/29/2000	Ulf Mattsson	0104-0311P	8546

7590 05/10/2004

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
P. O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

SHIFERAW, ELENI A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2136

DATE MAILED: 05/10/2004

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/725,005

Applicant(s)

MATTSSON ET AL.

Examiner

Eleni A Shiferaw

Art Unit

2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/29/2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claim 1-6 are presented for examination.

Specification

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because:

The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3-4, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ichihara (U.S. Patent 6,496,937) in view of Dunn (U.S. Patent 6701439).

5. As per claim 1, Ichihara teaches a method for which a database at least comprises one table with at least one user password, which password is used for logging on to said database, wherein said password is stored as a hash value, said method comprising the steps of:

adding a trigger (date and time) to said table, said trigger at least triggering an action (generating password) through a database (Col. 6 lines 15-45, and Figures 3,6);

calculating a new password hash value differing from said stored password hash value when said trigger is triggered (col. 2 lines 33-41, col. 3 lines 55-66, col.6 lines 15-45, and Fig. 3);

replacing said stored password hash value with said new password hash value. (Col. 4 lines 14-21, and col. 8 line 49-53);

Ichihara fails to teach preventing an administrator to impersonate a user of a relational database and triggering when an administrator alters said table through a database management system (DBMS).

However, Dunn teaches fraud detection and nuisance reporting features to impede discourage and surveil unauthorized users, and rejecting message is returned when a hacker tries to break in to a system. (Col. 5 lines 56-67; col. 6 lines 23-45);

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ichihara and Dunn to prevent an administrator to impersonate a user of a relational database and triggering when an administrator alters said table through a database management system (DBMS)

because it would provides for identification and surveillance of suspected hackers so that appropriate action will be taken against them.

6. As per claim 3, Ichihara and Dunn disclose comparing for each active user having access to sensitive data, the hash value of the current login password with the hash value of the currently stored password (Ichihara, col. 5 line 56 - col. 6 line 52; Dunn, col. 3 lines 21-37; col. 6 lines 23-45).

7. As per claim 4, Ichihara and Dunn teach comparing is performed after every change of the database content by the user (Ichihara, col. 5 line 56 - col. 6 line 52; Dunn, col. 3 lines 21-37; col. 6 lines 23-45).

8. As to claim 6, it has similar limitations as claim 1; therefore, it is being rejected under the same rationale.

9. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ichihara (U.S. Patent 6,496,937), Dunn (U.S. Patent 6701439), and further in view of Leighton et al. (Leighton, Patent No. 4,995,081).

10. As per claim 2, Ichihara teaches comparing said trigger control value at the startup and at regular intervals with a recalculated check value. (Col. 6 lines 16-28; monitor when predetermined number of elapsed dates and time measured by the timer);

Ichihara and Dunn teach the invention as discussed above. However, Ichihara and Dunn do not explicitly teach calculating a check value of said trigger such as a hash value.

Leighton teaches that hash function that being used to calculate a value is well-known (col. 5 line 57- col. 6 line10).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ichihara, Dunn, and Leighton to use hash function to calculate a check value of said trigger because it would prevent unauthorized use during transaction processing.

11. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ichihara (U.S. Patent 6,496,937), in view of Dunn (U.S. Patent 6701439), and further in view of Geary (U.S. Patent 6,070,160).

12. As per claim 5, Ichihara and Dunn teach the invention as discussed above. However, Ichihara and Dunn do not explicitly teach means for reading a log of actions on said database, means for identifying commands for altering user passwords in said log and means for identifying which user passwords that have been changed.

Geary teaches security routine that provides passwords, change passwords, control deletions from the system, perform audits, add and delete users, review logs (Col. 14 lines 1-11, and Figs. 2 and 4).


It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ichihara, Dunn, and Geary to read a log of actions on said database, to identify commands for altering user passwords in said log and which user passwords that have been changed because it would enhance overall computer security.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eleni A Shiferaw whose telephone number is 7033050326. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R Sheikh can be reached on 7033059648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

e.s.


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100